

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated October 10, 2008. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 14-15, 18-19, 21, 26-28, and 31-33 are pending. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 14-15, 18-19, 21, 26-28, and 31-33 are rejected. Claims 31-33 have been amended. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 14-15, 18-19, 21, 26-28, and 31-33 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 31-33 have been amended to further define the scope and novelty of the present invention, in view of the Examiner's comments, in order to place the claims in condition for allowance. Support for the amendments to these claims may be found in the Specification, for example, on page 9, line 23, to page 10, line 2; page 17, lines 14-23; and page 18, line 2. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been presented.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 14-15, 18-19, 21, 26-28, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Sharma et al. (US 2003/0204645) in view of Ning et al. (PTO-892). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Sharma does not teach or suggest that "data sources of each of the client applications store different types of data in different formats, wherein the data from a given data source is not directly accessible by the other client applications that utilize data of a different type or format," as recited in amended independent claims 31-33. The Examiner referred generally to paragraphs 5, 8-10, 37, 115, and 127 of Sharma as describing the adapter API providing step. However, these paragraphs merely describe a "need for Java based APIs for XML data that developers may use to offer RPC based services to clients," and "APIs that support an extensible type mapping between XML data types and Java Types." In other words, the APIs referred in Sharma are limited to Java language. Furthermore, Sharma does not mention different data sources that store different types of

data in different formats. In contrast to Sharma, the claimed adapter API is language independent, allowing for a more heterogeneous system.

The Examiner more specifically referred to paragraph 37 of Sharma, asserting that Sharma teaches client applications that can be based on Java or non-Java systems and can operate on any platform. However, paragraph 37 of Sharma does not specifically discuss data sources that store different types of data in different formats. Instead, paragraph 37 describes a general system environment. This paragraph states that the “system environment may be implemented with non-Java based computing nodes or platforms,” where a “Java based service client may be capable of using an XML-based RPC service deployed on a non-Java based platform.” In other words, while the XML-based RPC service may be deployed on a non-Java based platform, the service client is still Java based. As such, data would also be limited to a type and format compatible with Java language. Therefore, these claims are allowable over Sharma for at least this reason.

Sharma also does not teach or suggest submitting each of the XML files from the client applications to an import repository at a server, “wherein the import repository is separate from a database at the server,” as recited in amended independent claims 31-33. The Examiner referred generally to paragraphs 5, 115, and 127 of Sharma as describing the submitting step. However, none of these paragraphs specifically teach or suggest an “import repository” that is “separate from a database at the server.” Paragraph 5 only generally describes data that is “stored in a file maintained by the server.” Paragraphs 115 and 127 do not mention storage. Therefore, these claims are allowable over Sharma for at least this reason.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Sharma fails to teach the validation step. The Examiner relied on Ning to teach the validation step, referring to page 1635,

paragraph 2, last 14 lines, and page 1636, section C, of Ning. However, page 1635, paragraph 2, last 14 lines, of Ning only generally describes Document Type Definitions, and page 1636, section C, of Ning only generally describes a verify process. None of these sections of Ning mention or suggest validating each of the XML files in the import repository against a document type definition (DTD) "prior to storing data from the XML files in a database."

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that independent claims 31-33 and their respective dependent claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 14-15, 18-19, 21, and 26-28 are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 14-15, 18-19, 21, 26-28, and 31-33 as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen G. Sullivan/
Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38329
Telephone No: 650-969-7474

Date: January 8, 2009